

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The final Office Action mailed September 7, 2011, has been reviewed and these comments are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 7, and 30 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-12 and 18-30 are thus pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, and 18-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,438,752 to McClard (hereinafter “McClard”), in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0028871 to Wang et al. (hereinafter “Wang”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,801,747 to Bedard (hereinafter “Bedard”) in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0095676 to Knee et al (hereinafter “Knee”).

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClard, in view of Wang, Bedard, Knee, as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0020744 to Ellis et al. (hereinafter “Ellis”).

Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McClard, in view of Wang, Bedard, Knee, as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0104087 to Schaffer et al. (hereinafter “Schaffer”).

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent Claim 1

The references of record do not teach or suggest the features disclosed in independent claim 1. For example, amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

determining a plurality of demographic profiles based on the second set of categories, wherein each demographic profile is assigned to a different user;
receiving a set of advertisements;
storing the set of advertisements; and
selecting a first advertisement from the set of advertisements,
wherein the first advertisement is based on at least one of the demographic profiles.

The Office Action concedes that “McClard combined with Wang and Bedard fails to teach determining a demographic profile based on the second set of categories and selecting a first

advertisement based on the demographic profile.” P. 3. The Office Action relies on Knee to show these features. P. 4. At most, Knee describes a television distribution facility that distributes program guide and advertising information to user television equipment. Para. [0023]. Knee fails to teach or suggest receiving a set of advertisements *and storing the set of advertisements*, as recited in amended claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Independent Claims 7 and 30

Amended claims 7 and 30 recite substantially similar features as claim 1 and are thus allowable for substantially similar reasons as presented above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 7 and 30 be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

Dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 18-29 are allowable for the at least the same reasons as their respective base claims and further in view of the additional features recited therein. The addition of Ellis, Schaffer or Bedard, alone or in combination, fails to cure the deficiencies of McClard, Wang and Knee with respect to claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests all rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the present amendment and notification of allowance. If any fees are due, or if an overpayment has been made, the Director is authorized to debit or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2012

By: /s/ Stephanie L. Roberts
Stephanie L. Roberts
Registration No. 62,473
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: 202-824-3000
Fax: 202-824-3001